

### **REMARKS**

**Claims 1-6 and 9-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102e as being anticipated by Lee, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054745**

Independent claim 1 is amended to include all the limitations of dependent claims 2, 3,  
5 and 4. Claims 2, 3 and 4 are correspondingly cancelled. Similarly, independent claim 10 is  
amended to include all the limitations of dependent claims 11, 12, and 13. Claims 11, 12 and  
13 are correspondingly cancelled. Independent claim 18 is amended to include all the  
limitations of dependent claim 19 and also limitations similar to original claims 3 and 4.  
Claim 19 is correspondingly cancelled. And independent claim 21 is amended to include all  
10 the limitations of dependent claim 22 and also limitations similar to original claims 3 and 4.  
Claim 22 is correspondingly cancelled. No new matter is entered. Concerning the  
patentability of currently amended claims 1, 10, 18, and 21, applicant asserts that such claim  
amendments render claims 1, 10, 18, and 21 patentably distinguishable from the teachings of  
the cited reference of Lee. The reasoning is provided below.

15 Specifically, concerning claim 1, applicant points out that Lee does not teach “wherein  
the identification string is a supplementary service control string (SSC string); and the mobile  
unit conforms to the global system for mobile communications (GSM) specification”, as is  
claimed in currently amended claim 1. In the original rejection of claim 2, the Examiner  
stated in the Office action mailed 10/27/2006 that “Lee teaches an identification string that is  
20 defined in GSM specifications (ie, SSC string) (see paragraphs [0006] and [0028-0029])”.  
However, the applicant respectfully points out this is not equivalent to teaching utilizing the  
SSC string. In particular, inspection of the cited paragraphs, and in fact all paragraphs of the  
disclosure of Lee shows that Lee does not teach the identification string is a supplementary  
service control string (SSC string) of the GSM specification. (emphasis added) In fact, Lee  
25 does not teach the SSC string whatsoever. Concerning the identification string, Lee states in  
paragraph [0028] that, “The characteristic code of the language currently supported by the  
string set is recorded on the language code field 116”. The language code field 116 is

illustrated in Fig.3 by Lee. Applicant notes that such operation is not equivalent or even similar to the present invention as claimed in currently claimed 1 for at least the reason that the identification string is not the supplementary service control string (SSC string).

The present invention further supports and also describes benefits of utilizing the SSC string as the identification reference. For example see the following paragraphs of the present invention:

“in the present embodiment, a supplementary service control string (SSC string) is utilized to be an identification string 41 utilized for corresponding to a language information set 42 of a specific natural language.” (paragraph [26] – emphasis added)

“Therefore, manufacturers cannot redefine SSC strings. In the present invention, SSC strings are respectively utilized for representing language information sets 42 of different natural languages. Hence, the language information sets 42 corresponding to different natural languages supported in the multi-language system 30 are modulized to form the language information module 50, such that the interface module 32 can read the language information sets 42 corresponding to different natural languages by reading the SSC strings stored in the language information module 50. In the present embodiment, the language information module 50 is a configuration file.” (paragraph [26] – emphasis added)

“SSC strings are utilized to be identification strings 41 corresponding to the natural languages presently supported in the multi-language system 30. For example, \*#0886# corresponds to Traditional Chinese, \*#0086# corresponds to Simplified Chinese, and \*#0044# corresponds to English. When the interface module 32 reads \*#0886#, \*#0086# and \*#0044#, it knows that the mobile phone (the multi-language system 30) can support three natural languages, Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese and English.” (paragraph [33] – emphasis added)

“each element in the multi-language system 30 communicates with each other using SSC strings. Hence, when a manufacturer needs to modify (eg: add or delete) a natural language supported in the multi-language system 30, it is only necessary to modify the language information module 50 and the font database 45, and the interface module 32 does not need to be modified.”  
(paragraph [36] – emphasis added)

As Lee does not teach each and every limitation claimed by the present invention in currently amended independent claim 1, said claimed limitation being supported in the specification and having benefits described, applicant asserts that claim 1 should not be found rejected under 35 USC 102e as being anticipated by Lee. A similar argument also applies to currently amended independent claims 10, 18, and 21. Reconsideration of claims 1, 10, 18, and 21 is respectfully requested. Claims 5-9 and 14-17 are dependent upon claims 1 and 10, respectfully, and should also be found allowable for at least the same reason. Similarly, claims 20 and 23 are dependent upon claims 18 and 21, respectfully, and should also be found allowable for at least the same reason.

**Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC 103a as being unpatentable over Lee, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054745**

As previously mentioned, claims 7 and 8 are dependent upon base claim 1, which is believed allowable over the cited reference of Lee for at least the above stated reason. For at least this reason, applicant also asserts that dependent claims 7 and 8 should not be found rejected under 35 USC 103a as being unpatentable over the teachings of Lee. Reconsideration of claims 7 and 8 is respectfully requested.

**New Claims**

New claims 24 and 25 are added being dependent upon base claim 1. No new matter is added. In particular, claim 24 is supported in paragraph [14] of the specification as originally

filed and claim 25 is supported in paragraph [36] of the specification as originally filed.

Concerning the patentability of new claim 24 with respect to the teachings of the cited reference of Lee, applicant points out that Lee does not teach that the interface module is a piece of program code executable by the microprocessor. Concerning the patentability of new claim 25 with respect to the teachings of the cited reference of Lee, applicant points out that Lee does not teach that elements in the multi-language system communicate with each other using SSC strings. For at least these reasons applicant asserts that new claims 24 and 25 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of Lee.

Consideration of new claims 24 and 25 is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/24/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)